

Douglas J. Melton, Bar No. 161353
Shane M. Cahill, Bar No. 227972
LONG & LEVIT LLP
465 California Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 397-2222
Facsimile: (415) 397-6392
Email: dmelton@longlevit.com
scahill@longlevit.com

Attorneys for San Francisco Defendants

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE ROE, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

SFBSC MANAGEMENT, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

NICOLE HUGHES, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

S.A.W. ENTERTAINMENT, LTD., et al.,

Defendants.

ELANA PERA, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

S.A.W. ENTERTAINMENT, LTD., et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Case No. 14-cv-03616-LB

Related Cases: 16-cv-03371-LB

17-cv-00138-LB

17-cv-05288-LB

17-cv-06971-LB

19-cv-03960-LB

**UPDATED CASE MANAGEMENT
STATEMENT AND REQUEST TO
CONTINUE 4/21/2022 HEARING ON
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

The Honorable Laurel Beeler

POOHRAWN MEHRABAN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BT California, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

ELAINE GOMEZ-ORTEGA, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

DÉJÀ VU – SAN FRANCISCO, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

JANE ROES 1 AND 2, et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

DÉJÀ VU SERVICES, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

1 After extensive negotiations between the parties, an agreement in principle has been
 2 reached to resolve the objections to the Settlement Agreement in the “San Francisco Roe”
 3 (Case No. 14-cv-03616-LB) and “San Diego Roe” (Case No. 19-cv-03960-LB) actions,
 4 which were filed by the Lichten & Liss-Riordan law firm on February 25, 2022 and March 21,
 5 2022, respectively. *See*, San Francisco Roe ECF No. 244; San Diego Roe ECF No. 109. The
 6 parties are evaluating necessary modifications to the Settlement Agreement that will or may
 7 need to be made as part of resolution of the objections. Moreover, the parties will be
 8 preparing and submitting briefing, including a potential motion or proposed stipulation and
 9 order, to the Court for approval of resolution of the objections pursuant to Fed. Rule of Civ.
 10 Pro. Sec. 23(e)(5)(B). Based on the foregoing, and after conferring with Plaintiffs’ and
 11 Objectors’ counsel, the parties propose that the April 21, 2022 hearing on Plaintiffs’ motion
 12 for preliminary approval be continued 21 days, or to a later date as convenient for the Court.

13
 14 DATED: April 19, 2022

LONG & LEVIT LLP

15 By: /s/ *Shane M. Cahill*

16 DOUGLAS J. MELTON, SBN 161353
 17 SHANE M. CAHILL, SBN 227972
 18 Attorneys for Defendants
 19 SFBSC MANAGEMENT, LLC and the SAN
 20 FRANCISCO NIGHTCLUBS
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28